From: **Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US**
Sent: 6/13/2012 10:44:54 AM

To: Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA; Joe Dorsey/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
CC:
Subject: Fw: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock R3 File 1205012 FINAL R33992 06 06 12 1230.pdf

This is the draft email to send out but I think more explanation is needed for at least #1.

Cynthia Caporale, Chief
OASQA Laboratory Branch
U.S. EPA Region III
Environmental Science Center
Fort Meade, MD
(410) 305-2732
Fax: (410) 305-3095
----- Forwarded by Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US on 06/13/2012 10:44 AM -----

From: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
To: Ex. 4 - CBI
Cc: Ex. 4 - CBI P, Gary Newhart/CI/USEPA/US@EPA, John Gilbert/CI/USEPA/US@EPA, Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, "Ex. 4 - CBI Ex. 4 - CBI, Robin Costas/ESC/R3/USEPA/US, Joe Dorsey/ESC/R3/USEPA/US
Date: 06/13/2012 08:52 AM
Subject: Re: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock R3 File 1205012 FINAL R33992 06 06 12 1230.pdf

The report on the Dimock Verification/Completenees Check for file 1205012 FINAL R33992 was reviewed and below are the responses for your consideration.

File 1205012 FINAL R33992 06 06 12 1230.pdf

1. All samples for lithium in project #DAS R33992 are reported down to a Reporting Limit of 25µg/L; however, the method blanks are reported to 200µg/L. If the method blanks were not analyzed with the same low standard as the samples, then the sample RLs should be raised to the concentration reported for the method blanks. Alternatively, if the samples and blanks were analyzed using the same low standard, then the analytical report needs to be corrected to reflect the correct method blank RLs.

Response: **The reporting limits for method blanks were 25 ug/L.**

2. The case narrative states that the detectable results for uranium were qualified estimated "J" due to a quality control sample outside of acceptance limits. Based on the information supplied in the analytical report, it is unclear what QC sample is outside of acceptance limits. Please clarify with the appropriate recoveries.

Response: **The second source calibration verification and continuing calibration verification QC sample failed for U .**

3. The case narrative states that sample results for aluminum, boron, lead and lithium for sample HW06_R2 were qualified estimated "J" due to a quality control sample outside acceptance limits. No QC information is available for boron for Batch BE23003. Based on the information supplied in the analytical report, the LCS recovery for lithium is 125%, which is outside the 85-115% range. In addition, the RPD for aluminum exceeds the 20% criterion. Based on this information, the lithium result for sample HW06_R2 should be qualified estimated high (J+) and the aluminum result estimated (J). It is unclear what QC sample is outside of acceptance limits for boron and lead. Please clarify with the appropriate recoveries.

Response: **We normally do not assign estimated high (J+) based on qc recoveries. The qualifiers for Li and Al are correct (J). The J was applied to Pb & B because the second source calibration verification was recovered at 112% and 106% respectively.**

4. For sample IDW-01, it is unclear what set of QC should be used to qualify samples. Please clarify that this sample was analyzed with Batch BE22502.

Resposne: **This sample was analyzed with Batch BE3003 for ICPMS 200.8 and BE22502 for ICP 200.7**

5. The following samples had analytes that exceeded the federal maximum contaminant levels (MCLs): Aluminum for HW06_R2; iron for HW06_R2; and manganese for HW07_R2 and HW08a_R2 and HW08-F_R2. IDW-01 is not a drinking water sample so any concentrations exceeding the MCLs are not included in the list.

Response: **No response needed.**

6. There were several non-typical metals that were detected in some of the drinking water samples for which no MCLs are available: Boron for HW06_R2 and HW06-F_R2, uranium for HW04_R2, HW04-F_R2, HW07_R2, HW08a_R2 and HW08a-F_R2; and lithium for HW06_R2 and HW06-F_R2.

Response: **No response needed.**

7. It is assumed that all required instrument QC in the method was run (with the exceptions noted in the case narrative) and was within the criteria listed in the EPA R3 SOPs since this information is not available in the laboratory report.

Response: Correct

Cynthia Caporale, Chief
OASQA Laboratory Branch
U.S. EPA Region III
Environmental Science Center
Fort Meade, MD
(410) 305-2732
Fax: (410) 305-3095

From: **Ex. 4 - CBI**
To: Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, Kelley Chase/R3/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Gary Newhart/CI/USEPA/US@EPA, John Gilbert/CI/USEPA/US@EPA, **Ex. 4 - CBI**
Ex. 4 - CBI
Date: 06/11/2012 02:12 PM
Subject: Verification/Completeness Check for Dimock R3 File 1205012 FINAL R33992 06 06 12 1230.pdf

.....is attached for your review and consideration. I made a correction on the footer.

Ex. 4 - CBI
Lockheed Martin
Scientific, Engineering, Response and Analytical Services (SERAS)
Ex. 4 - CBI

[attachment "SERAS-172-DSR-061112_59.docx" deleted by Cynthia Caporale/ESC/R3/USEPA/US]